

in the pages that follow to cement this very important argument, with a collation of their and other academics work.

Humphreys in the BBC documentary earlier mentioned in 2011, uses a term I used earlier at 7 minutes and 40 seconds into the program "State Sponsored Slavery" and through numerous well chosen examples and illustrations paints a vulgar picture of the modern era, before I cite some of her assertions and evidence I would also like to revisit some other primary sources. Historian author, ~~broed~~ journalist (newspaper and own website), John Simkin (BA, MA, MPhil) from his website (educational resource - "Spartacus Educational" [www.spartacuseducational.com/1R/workhouse.htm](http://www.spartacuseducational.com/1R/workhouse.htm)) on "Workhouse Children", where he informs the reader that "many parents were unwilling to allow their children to work in these new textile factories. To overcome this labour shortage factory owners had to find other ways of obtaining workers. One solution was to buy children from orphanages and workhouses. The children became known as pauper apprentices. This involved the children signing contracts that virtually made them the property of the factory owner". Humphreys assert that many water powered mills were far from towns and villages and it was a majority of children that gathered to work them ("Childhood and child labour in the British Industrial Revolution", Jane Humphreys, Economic History Review, 2012). Simkin cites examples of how children were taken by force from their parents, and that their parents were not informed as to where their children had been sent, which resulted in untold misery for parent and child. He tells us how the owners of the large textile mills "purchased large numbers of children from workhouses in all large towns and cities" and that by the end of